

# Gandhian Philosophy: A Solution of World Terrorism

## Abstract

In the present day world community, the term 'terrorism' has drawn the attention of all people across the world. It is because of its deep rooted effect on the social set up. Terrorism has become one of the most important cause evoking serious and real threats to the security of a person, a family, a society, a state and international system, it has also become a threat for the civilization, culture, property, democratic system and natural development of human society and civilization. Terrorism has a number of causes such as poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, discrimination, caste, ethnic diversity, religious conflict and so on. These problems only can be resolved by peace otherwise, they will be the burial of the world, that is why we should think about the Gandhian philosophy.

**Keywords:** Violence, Peace, Terrorism, Conflict, Insurgency.

## Introduction

In the present day world community, the term 'terrorism' has drawn the attention of all people across the world. It is because of its deep rooted effect on the social set up. Terrorism has become one of the most important cause evoking serious and real threats to the security of a person, a family, a society, a state and international system, it has also become a threat for the civilization, culture, property, democratic system and natural development of human society and civilization. Terrorism has a number of causes such as poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, discrimination, caste, ethnic diversity, religious conflict and so on. Because these factors generate conflict in society, if any conflict solves early then the conflict does not convert in crises otherwise it can converted a crises and a crises or conflict is converted in terrorism such as LTTE, ULFA, Mujahedde, Jihadists, Hindu Fundamentalists, Al-Qaida, Lashker -e-Toiba, Jamait - ul- Dawa, ISIS and so on. But we can solve these conflicts only peaceful means. But immediately after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre (WTC) and the Pentagon, the idea of taking a non violent stance in response to terrorism would have been dismissed out of hand, but now, after the invasion and occupation of Muslim countries by the U.S. military, the loss of thousands of American soldiers and tens of thousands of innocent Afghans, Iraqis, Syrians and the start of a global Jihadi war with ISIS that seems unending virtually any alternative seems worth considering. It is in this context that various forms of less militant response, including the method of conflict resolution adopted by India's nationalist leader, Mohandas Gandhi, derives a second look.

Like today, that time Gandhi also had to deal with terrorism, and his responses show that he was a tough minded realist.<sup>1</sup> Gandhi argued in Hind Swaraj that violence never works as a response to violence. It usually generates more violence as a result, and precipitates a seemingly endless litany of tit-for-tat militant engagements.<sup>2</sup> Such as example, it was the event of 9/11, which led to George W. Bush declaring a war against terror, transforming his policy into one of global projection and intervention on a scale not seen since the high of the cold war to confrontation with the Soviet Union.<sup>3</sup> The American public was shocked by the scale of the death and destruction caused by the terrorist attack on WTC and pentagon in which nearly 3000 were killed vulnerably of the US homeland to what seemed to them to be a new kind of war. Hence, President Bush's declaration of war against terror and captured the public mood.<sup>4</sup>

USA formatted a coalition military against terrorism under the United Nation Security Council (UNSC), which fought against Taliban rulers, who had given safe haven and protection of Oshama-Bin-Laden. Even some-neo-conservatives claims that Saddam was also somehow involved in plotting the 9/11 attacks and that he was in league with Bin-



**Krishan Kumar**

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Political Science,  
BPS Mahila Viswavidyala,  
Khanpur Kalan, Sonipat

Laden. The truth is that president Bush and Prime Minister Blair, America's majority and supporter in the invasion of Iraq took their countries to war on a bogus prospectus. They were arguing that Saddam was helping terrorist groups and terrorists.

But, was that action right, which was taken by USA against terrorism, and after that terrorism has reduced? Or will it work for peace? Or will it generate new type of problems for the world peace?

In the case of Iraq, it is stated that USA did invasion in Iraq on the ground of that it was supporting terrorist groups and terrorists and another grounds that it had weapons of mass destruction (WMD). May be both grounds were true that time but which methods of conflict resolution were used by American's group. They did not work that time, and today world is facing more and more violence based problems. Such as ISIS (Islamic States for Iraq and Syria) is a product of that destructive conflict.

So this example does true the views of Gandhi that violence generates more violence. There is an oft quoted saying of Gandhi: "There is no way to peace. Peace is the only way." However, Peace is not what the term "peace" means in semantics. Peace is a crusade. It is a movement – continuous and perennial –bringing about so many conflicts enrooted. Peace is not realizable without conflicts. Highly interactive conflict resolution attempts represent peace process only<sup>5</sup>. So now there is a need to think about Gandhian methods tackle for the problem of terrorism.

#### **Scope of The Study**

Terrorism, like democracy and human rights, is one of the terms frequently appearing in the media today. It would be difficult to define it precisely and cleanly in a few words, distinguishing it from other types of violence. A book on the subject (Political Terrorism by Alex Schemid 1983) listed over 100 definitions of the term. To give another example, different government agencies in the US have produced different definitions of the term. A list of definitions by different US government agencies described in a newspaper article (Terrorism – A Term Notoriously Difficult to Pin Down, by Rushworth M. Kidder, Christian Science Monitor, April 18, 1986, p.12) included samples from the US department of defense, FBI state department, department of Justice and the vice president's task force on combating terrorism. As one goes through these definitions, the term 'unlawful' use of force of violence is used in three words. These three words – coercion, intimidation and non-combatant targets – highlight the main problem of a proper acceptable definition of terrorism as a specific form of violence and its shifty use by parties either criticizing terrorism of defending such acts. If the term unlawful is included, one will have the additional problem of treating cases of the establishment approved acts of coercion and their liaison with unlawful elements in society in the past and contemporary times.<sup>6</sup>

If we trace the origin of the term, it comes from the Latin word *terrere* to frighten. The English words, terror and terrible have the same origin. It we use the original meaning of the term, terror has been

used regularly as a technique throughout history to maintain power and enforce policies by arousing fear in the ruled. The simplest way to categorize terrorism as different from other major types of violence that has marked human history is to distinguish it from assassination; regular war, and guerilla war, communal riots are a separate type of violence in the sense that they generally involve collective behaviour not organized behavior, while the goal of communal riots can be the same as that of organized acts of terrorism, this species of violence can be treated as a separate category.

#### **Terrorism**

"Terrorism" is the violent act involving massacre and indiscriminate killing of innocent people for the purpose of drawing political attention by generating mass fear psychosis to attain certain political and motivated ends or goals. Its example we can see in the Afghanistan, where some groups had gained power and now they are ruling some part of the country.<sup>7</sup>

There are, among several others, three major types of terrorism such as 'insurgency', 'militancy' and 'terrorism'. "Insurgency" involves revolutionary and guerrilla activities against the military force of a State. "Militancy" is the more aggressive and even violent wing of a political party. Prime target of militancy is also military, para-military, armed soldiers and police forces of the State machinery. However, they do not hesitate to go for other destructive and absolutely violent acts when it is required to attain their ends. "Terrorism" is the violent act involving massacre and indiscriminate killing of innocent people for the purpose of drawing political attention by generating mass fear psychosis to attain certain political and motivated ends or goals. All three types of above mentioned activities involve absolute and utterly destructive violence.

One interesting point about the history of assassination is that the victims have often been the advocates of peace. Lord Budha was the target of unsuccessful assassination plots. Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King were assassinated. Count fold Bernadotte who went to west Asia as a UN mediator to work out a peace formula was assassinated in September 1948 by a Jewish terrorist gang. An American report on the subject mentioned earlier (Assassination and Political violence 1970) presented data in support at the thesis that the US ranks relatively high in frequency of assassinations even when the data are adjusted for population size.<sup>8</sup>

Thus it is stated that violence generate more violence terrorism is a type of conflict which could not resolve by peaceful way. Gandhi was adamantly opposed to the political positions that justified terrorism but he was remarkably lenient to word the terrorists themselves. In the case of the assassination that occurred when Gandhi was in London in 1909, he did not blame Dhingra, the assassin of Curzon – Wyllie. He said that Dhingra as a person was not the main problems. Rather, Gandhi said, he was like a drunkard in the grip of 'a mad idea'. The difficulty was the 'mad idea' not the terrorists.<sup>9</sup>

Due to the mad idea, 16 December, 2014, a group of misguided people did a massacre of school children in Peshawar on the name of religion, because these terrorists shouted, 'Allan-o-Akbar' before they pumped thousands of bullets into school children. How could they call upon a benevolent, merciful god while they that the unarmed and vulnerable, including a little girl who was attending her first day of school?

After that Gandhi's philosophy is more relevant of conflict resolution, Gandhi believed in god truth and non-violence, for in a real sense these concepts constitute the essence of his thought. Even Gandhiji wanted every Indian to take pledge in 1919, for creating communal harmony among people. The pledge was with god as a witness, we Hindus and Muslim declare that we shall behave towards one another as children of the same parents, that we shall have no difference that the sorrows of each will be the sorrows of the other and each shall help that other in removing them. We shall respect each other's religion and religious feelings, and shall not stand in the way of our respective religious practices. We shall always refrain from violence to each other in the name of religion. Gandhiji was a secular person who believed in religious equality.

But these days the situation is complicated by the presence of various religious groups within the world, which are not ready to compromise on any ground to reach a platform of communality.<sup>10</sup>

But religion is just a method for mobilization of some people and preparing them to create violence activities, the roots of these 'mad ideas' are living in some other place, such as poverty, unemployment, and religious disharmony.

Terrorism is a type of activity, which is used by a person, a group or a region and a nation, when all methods of conflict resolutions have failed. It is well said that human psychology plays a distinguished role in both conflict emergence and resolution. This is what Fraud observes (which Schellenberg quotes) that violence has always been the final arbiter of human conflicts. Fundamental to the concept, three components constitute the whole discussion. These are human instinct, human need and human behaviour.

All the three are inter-linked with each other. Fraud explores human aggression an innate trait that cannot be shunned while assessing the factor leading to conflict situations. He digs out the psychological roots of human aggression through two individual instincts: life and death. Referring to life instinct as the desire for pleasure, he identifies death instinct as 'destructive instinct when it is directed outwards on to objects. Thus the externalization of such inner impulse comes out in the form of aggressive behaviour. And aggression is not only dangerous but also a tendency over which man has no control. But what are those elements for which humans lose their control over their tendency? These may be a number of such factor, for example, denial of rights, dissatisfaction of needs, a sense of deprivation within a particular layer of society, competition between or among the groups, individuals, states, injustice, corruption, poverty, unemployment etc. of these, the

elements that leads individuals to be engaged in war or genocide, in most of the cases is the dissatisfaction of human needs.

J.W. Burton discovers three fundamentals needs of the individuals that should be satisfied. These are identity, recognition and security. If human needs get no satisfaction at all, their inner tendency awakens and expresses itself in somewhat, violent and notorious manner.

So aggression is an outcome of frustration and frustration generates violence. A number of time, it is seen whenever a family does not fulfill the needs of a family member then the member goes in frustration and after a some time his/her frustration outcome in the form of violence. In the same way a group of people feel that present system or scenarios will disturb their identity and does not recognize them and them also afraid that in this system they will not secure, then they will definitely do revolt against the system or state or even society. For example Sri Lankan's terrorist group LTTE (Liberation of Tiger Tamil Elam), which was created by unsatisfied Tamils vis-a- vis on the ground of security perspective, we can put example of ULFA (United Liberation Front Asham), in India and even on the ground of recognition, we can put example to the partition of Pakistan.

British India partition happened on the ground of religion, but Pakistan partition happened on the ground of discrimination by West Pakistan with East Pakistan. West Pakistan was ignoring East Pakistan culture and language, Pakistan was going to make Urdu as a national language while East Pakistan's population speaks Bengali language.

So a lot of examples in the history when people did revolt terrorist types activity if they feel that their identity, recognition and security in dangers. So that is why we should talk about Gandhi's method for conflict resolution Gandhi wanted solve all problems with love, truth, non-violence. He did not recognize violence in any condition and today's global terrorism a type of violence but this violence does not remove by violence, it can be removed only by Gandhian Way and that is Satyagraha.

Gandhi believed in the goodness of human being, he said that some circumstances make a man bad. Even Aristotle said that observation is known as 'nature versus nurture'. The social intercourse of man, his experiences either good or bad surroundings, atmosphere etc. mould his nature. Gandhi stated that satyagraha is a method, which can change the heart of opponents.

*Satyagraha* is one of the greatest contributions of Gandhi to Indian history, in particular and world history, in general. It was coined by Gandhi to express the nature of his action against the 'racial discrimination' in South Africa. The technique of *Satyagraha* was used for the first time during the resistance of Indian workers of South Africa against the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance of 1906. He discovered the 'Science of *Satyagraha*' by his experiments with truth. Gandhi quoted in 1933:

The Science of *Satyagraha* ... has come to me... by scientific

research. It is a result of the hardest labor a human being is capable of. I have applied to this research all the skill of a scientist.

The principle of *Satyagraha* was a most powerful and fruitful weapon used by Gandhi and his followers against the British rule in India. In India, it was used for the first time in Bihar in 1917 and after that was used number of time till 1947, when India got its independence.

It is based on the principle of love and believes in 'love for all' and 'suffer for all'. It excludes the use of any form of violence since it is based on the philosophy that man does not know the absolute truth and therefore, cannot punish anyone.

Earlier Gandhi used the term passive resistance for *Satyagraha* but latter he grew dissatisfied with the expression. *Satyagraha* differs from passive resistance in many ways. Passive resistance is static and is a weapon of the weak while *Satyagraha* is active and is an instrument of bravest who have courage to face sufferings. Mahadev Desai wrote in *Harijan*:

"... *satyagraha* is dynamic, passive resistance is static. Passive resistance acts negatively and suffers reluctantly and in fruituously; *satyagraha* acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness because from love and makes the sufferings fruitful."<sup>11</sup>

*Satyagraha* or non-violent action means soul-force or truth-force that it is based on and is a way to achieve truth.

#### Objectives of The Study

The Objectives of the study is to investigate the following:

1. To understand conflict and its impact on Indian society.
2. What are the obstacles in the way of peace?
3. What are the causes of conflict and how a conflict generates terrorist groups?
4. How the Terrorism can be resolved by Gandhian way?
5. What is the relevance of Gandhian's techniques in the present day society?
6. What was the legacy of Gandhi which provided successors to make better strategy about remove terrorism?

#### Hypotheses

1. Conflict is a part of human nature.
2. Power is mostly used for conflict resolution.
3. *Satyagraha* and *Ahimsa* are not useful in the present day society.
4. Terrorism is a natural problem of society.

#### Review of Literature

As stated earlier, conflict resolution a Gandhian perspective have become a topic of numerous academic discourses and writings, not due to an old thoughts, but recently due to its rise in international world order. Since then, there are a number of books and articles have been written on Gandhi's way on conflict resolution.

Joan Valerie Bondurant's, "*Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*" highlights When Mahatma Gandhi died in 1948 by an assassin's bullet, the most potent legacy he left to the world was the technique of *satyagraha* (literally, holding on to the Truth). His "experiments with Truth" were far from complete at the time of his death, but he had developed a new technique for effecting social and political change through the constructive conduct of conflict: Gandhians *satyagraha* had become eminently more than "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience" By relating what Gandhi said to what he did and by examining instances of *satyagraha* led by others, this book abstracts from the Indian experiments those essential elements that constitute the Gandhian technique. It explores, in terms familiar to the Western reader, its distinguishing characteristics and its far-reaching implications for social and political philosophy.<sup>12</sup>

Jai Narain Sharma's, "*Satyagraha Gandhi's Approach to Conflict Resolution*", in this book highlighted that in times such as ours when conflict is the order of the day and the potential of technology offers more to fear than to hope, social, political theory face their gravest challenge. Theoretical political systems have grown increasingly suspect and intellectual formulations tend less to challenge than repel. The low standard, that are approved of and followed in conflict resolution tend progressively to lower our moral standards. Why is this so? It is because humanity so far been trying to solve conflicts by means through which they can never be solved. Evil cannot be cured by evil, nor hate conquered by hate. 'Satan cannot be exercised by Satan'. There is a great demand for solutions to the problems of conflict – not for theoretically systems of end-structure and aimed at ultimately eliminating conflict when it arises: ways which are constructive and not destructive. Such a demand must be met by a theory of process and of means and not of further concern for structure, for patterns and for ends.<sup>13</sup>

K.L.Shridharni's, "*War without Violence*" is an authentic work on *Satyagraha*. Shridaharni wrote it during the freedom struggle in the 40's when Mahatma Gandhi was alive. He has also discussed several points with Mahatma on *Satyagraha* for the students of non-violence, conflict resolution. It is magnum opus rather a classic work.<sup>14</sup>

Ramjee Singh, S. Sundaram's, "*Gandhi and the World Order*", in this book discusses about the Gandhian principles which are capable to mitigate the greatest challenge of the modern age. Gandhi's philosophy becomes pertinent in the present world due to complexity of human nature. Unity of mankind, service of man, application of moral principles considered valid for individual to group life and inter-state relation. Gandhi and the world Order an intellectual response to solve the contemporary dilemmas and conflicts arising out due to failure of developmental paradigms and failure of leadership. Even the welfare state is not responding as it was expected.<sup>15</sup>

Ashu Pasricha's, "*Peace Studies the Discipline and Dimensions*", in this book the writer

provides a comprehensive introduction to a wide ranging panorama of the ideas, theories and assumptions on which the study of peace is based. Can we stop war and live in peace? What are the causes deep rooted in society and obstacles to peace which time and again have given rise to conflicts? Can we not remove these causes and obstacles? Men are no doubt imbued with the instinct of fighting, but he has also the instinct for peaceful living. If the social environment is such as to give greater scope for his fighting instinct there will be conflicts/Wars, if the social environment is such as to give greater scope for the instinct of peaceful living, mankind will be more prone to live peacefully. These are the things writer emphasized in her work.<sup>16</sup>

Paul Wilkinson's, "*International Relations*", a very short introduction, an attempt to elaborate the chronological development of international relation it includes not only relations between states but also between states and non-state organization such as churches, humanitarian relief organizations and multinational corporations, and between states and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), such as the UN and the EU. The book explains also political thinker's thoughts such as Niccolo Machiavelli, President George W. Bush, Ayatollah Khomeini, prince Otto in Bismarck, Vladimir Itrich Lenin and Pape John Paul II. The writer discuss also about terrorism also a result of danger conflict when a conflict in so complies then come in way of terrorism<sup>17</sup>.

Parmeshwari Dayal's, "*Gandhian Theory of Social Reconstruction*", explains Human Society, and today is in a state of flux reflected by the threats to the peace and stability of society and the conditions of mass poverty, starvation, exploitation and widespread violence. The ecological imbalance and environmental pollution endangering the health and personal life of the people also threaten the human civilized life. The state of flux in further confounded by the new revelations of fraud and deceptions in one corporation after another and in one country after other sending shock waves around the globe. The faith of the people in corporate economic appears to be shaken even the leaders of capitalism declare that corporate scandals are threatening to undermine capitalism itself. Gandhian theory of social reconstruction is a response to such challenges that confront humanity. Gandhi has left behind a large legacy in the form of his writings written extensively on numerous issues concerning humanity that have been compiled almost in one hundred volumes. Gandhian theory of social reconstruction gives solutions by Satyagraha, Ahimsa, Non-violence and Non-corporation and truth etc.<sup>18</sup>

Ashu Pasricha's, "*Gandhi in Twenty-First Century*", is an edited volume which highlights different issues relating to Gandhi by writers as we have hailed Gandhi as Prophet, Crusader and Liberator but he has been seldom properly and critically understood. No doubt, he has been eulogized, romanticized and even mythologized but hardly conceptualized and rationalized. One of the writer highlighted that Gandhi has been remembered

in history because of his campaigns for seeking ultimate truth and by using the weapons of truth, love and non-violence to win autonomy for India. Gandhi said that "no one is competent to offer Satyagraha unless he has a living faith in God. And the Bhagvad Gita, to which he would always turn for inspiration, is the allegorical description, not of a Satyagraha campaign, but of the quest of the human soul for union with the supreme-master."<sup>19</sup>

Schellenberg, James A.'s, "*Conflict Resolution Theory, Research and Practice*", is a scholarly work in the study of conflict has expanded greatly in recent decades, as has the work of professionals who apply their efforts to the area of conflict resolution.<sup>20</sup>

Deutsch Morton, Peter T. Coleman and Eric C. Marcus's, "*The Handbook of Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice*", is an edited work. This handbook is a classic. It helps connect the research of academia to the practical realities of peacemaking and peacebuilding like no other. It is both comprehensive and deeply informed on topics vital to the field like power, gender, cooperation, emotion, and trust.<sup>21</sup>

A.M. Sadullah's, "*Terrorism: A Political Weapon*", is an article, which provides a short introduction of terrorism as a political weapon, and how to deal with the terrorist is a complex and complicated matter. The terrorists represent a motley crowd of some genuine freedom fighters and also some hoodlums who manage to infiltrate into this group because of their personal interest or a mere desire to achieve publicity through lawlessness in an atmosphere of present day social turmoil. Terrorism as part of the resistance movement strives to gain recognition through violence. So, contradictory though it may seem, terrorist violence has to be disciplined and permeated with politics<sup>22</sup>.

Mark Juergensmeyer's, "*Gandhi vs. Terrorism*", is an article, which explain about the Gandhi's views on terrorism, because Gandhi also faced terrorism, and his responses show that he was a tough-minded realist. He analyzed that violence generated more violence, and terrorism a type of violence which is generated by some misguided people, but he accepted that the major problem is not terrorists; major problem is mad idea, which presents a theory for justification of violence<sup>23</sup>.

#### **Methodology**

The historical and analytical methods are used, while conducting this research. It is mainly based on secondary sources such as books, research articles, journals, newspapers and internet etc. The primary sources reflected in the form of British Government documents, debates, official speeches and statements. As well as used the written data by Mahatma Gandhi.

#### **Conclusion**

In nutshell, Gandhi explained about what he means by using soul-force for *Satyagraha*: When I refuse to do a thing that is repugnant to my conscience, I use soul-force. For instance, the government of the day has passed a law which is applicable to me. I do not like it. If by violence I force

the government to replace the law, I am employing what may be termed body-force. If I do not obey the law and accept the penalty for its breach, I use soul-force. It involves sacrifice of the self.

There are three things of great importance in *Satyagraha*. These are *Satya* (Truth), *Ahimsa* (Non-Violence) and *Tapas* (Self-suffering). By *satyagraha*'s power we can solve following conflicts:

1. Moral Crisis with Non-violence Ashram, Anasakta Karma.
2. Religious Fundamentalism with Sarva Dharma Sambhava, Tolerance, Respect towards all Religions.
3. Educational Reform with Nai-Talim Adult Education.
4. Social Disturbance with Removal of Untouchability, Communal Unity, Sarvodaya, Upliftment of Women, Prohibition, Service of Backward Classes, Village Sanitation.
5. Political Conflicts with Swaraj, Decentralisation of Power, Democracy of Enlightened Majority.
6. Economic Problem with Trusteeship, Swadeshi, Bread Labour, Khadi and Village Industries. If all these conflicts can be solved with peace, then terrorism will be end itself.

#### References

1. Mark Juergensmeyer, "Gandhi vs.Terrorism", *Daedutus*, 136 (1), MIT press, America, p. 30
2. Mark Juergensmeyer, "Gandhi vs.Terrorism", *Daedutus*, 136 (1), MIT press, America, p. 34
3. Mark Juergensmeyer, "Gandhi vs.Terrorism", *Daedutus*, 136 (1), MIT press, America,
4. Mark Juergensmeyer, "Gandhi vs.Terrorism", *Daedutus*, 136 (1), MIT press, America,
5. Anurag Gangal (2009), *Gandhi and terrorism*, *Gandhian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies University of Jammu*, p.12
6. Robi Chakravorti (1994), *Terrorism Past, Present and Future*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 29, No.36, P. 2340
7. Anurag Gangal (2009), *Gandhi and terrorism*, *Gandhian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies University of Jammu*, p.83

8. Anurag Gangal (2009), *Gandhi and terrorism*, *Gandhian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies University of Jammu*, p.83
9. Mark Jurgenswer, *op. cit*,
10. Krishan Kumar and Dharmendra Singh (2015), *Religion: A Gandhian Perspective, Coherence*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.282-285)
11. *Harijan*, June 25, 1938, p.164.
12. Joan Valerie Bondurant (1959), *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
13. Jai Narain Sharma (2008), *Satyagraha Gandhi's Approach to Conflict Resolution Revisiting Gandhi*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company.
14. Shridhami, K. L. (1962), *War Without Violence*, Bombay, *BharatiyaVidyaBhawan*.
15. Ramjee Singh and S. Sundaram (1996), eds., *Gandhi and the World Order*, New Delhi, APH Publishing Corporation.
16. AshuPasricha (2003), *Peace Studies The Discipline and Dimensions*, New Delhi, Abhijeet Publications.
17. Paul Wilkinson (2012), *International Relations*, London: Oxford University.
18. ParmeshwariDayal (2013), *Gandhian Theory of Social Reconstruction*, New Delhi: Atlantic.
19. Ashu Pasricha (2011), ed., *Gandhi in Twenty-First Century*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep Publications.
20. Schellenberg, James A. (1996), *Conflict Resolution Theory, Research and Practice*, New York: State University of New York Press.
21. Deutsch Morton and Peter T. Coleman (2014) (eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
22. A.M. Sadullah (1986), "Terrorism: A Political Weapon", *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 39, No. 4, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, p.91-97.
23. Mark Juergensmeyer, "Gandhi vs.Terrorism" , *Daedutus*, 136 (1), MIT press, America, p. 30-39.